

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/574,219 | 10/03/2006 | Ulrike Schulz | P29299 | 2157 |
| | 7590 02/24/201 I & BERNSTEIN, P.L. | EXAMINER | | |
| 1950 ROLANI | O CLARKE PLACE | KARPINSKI, LUKE E | | |
| RESTON, VA | 20191 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1616 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/24/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/574,219 | SCHULZ ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| LUKE E. KARPINSKI | 1616 | | |

| | LUKE E. KARPINSKI | 1616 | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | R ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | |
| The period for reply expires months from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later, no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period value of 27 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL. | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee te action; or (2) as | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t | iled within two month | s of the date of | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t | | | cause | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | E below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is of will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 46-48 and 50-74. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing | a Notice of Anneal but prior to the | date of filing a brief w | vill not be | | | |
| entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| ···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | |
| /Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616 | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Banowski et al. teach too many possible embodiments. This argument is not found persuasive because Banowski et al. teach a finite areasonable number of embodiments. All compositions are to decdorant or antiperspirant compositions and one of ordinary skill in the art would have immediately recognized all functional equivalents for common components, further alpha hydroxycarboxylic acid was the framed beta-glucuroridase inhibiting substance and mandelic acid is the first aromatic alpha-hydroxycarboxylic acid named, also aluminum chlorohydrate is named as a preferred antiperspirant.

Applicant also argues that neither Banowski et al. nor Gers-Barlag mention the stabilization properties of the alpha-hydroxycarboxylic acid and mandelic acid and that said stabilizing properties are unexpected. This argument is not found persuasive because said references are not required to mention each and every property of a component; further Shen teaches that said stabilization effect is expected (col. 6). Applicant also argues that Yu et al. do not emphasize the use of mandelic acid. This argument is not found persuasive because the title of Yu et al. is "methods of treating wrinkles using mandelic acid," the examiner believes this is emphasis enough.

Applicant also argues that Yu et al. is non-analogous art because wrinkle reduction to the axillia is not associated with any benefit. This argument is not found persuasive because wrinkle reduction to ANY part of the skin is seen as a benefit.